

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated December 22, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 42, 43, 45, 50, 52-59, 61, 80, and 82-86 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 46, 47, and 89 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter has been added. Claims 42-45, 48-61, and 80-88 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

As a preliminary matter, the Office Action indicated that claims 61 and 80-83 have been allowed. The Office Action also indicated that claims 43-60 and 85-88 would be allowable if the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 were overcome. Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the allowance or allowability of these claims. As will be discussed below, Applicants submit that all of the outstanding rejections and objections have been addressed and overcome. As such, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action objected to claims 42-60 based on the recitation of “a first type of address.” Specifically, the Office Action alleged that, since there is only one type of address mentioned in the claim, the recitation of “first” should be deleted. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the recitation of “a first type of address” is proper. In particular, Applicants note that at least dependent claim 45 recites “a second type of

address.” Therefore, the recitation of “a first type of address” in claim 42 is necessary to differentiate that address from the “second type of address” recited in claim 45. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 89 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleged that the limitation of a “computer program, embodied on a computer readable medium” is not described in the specification. Although Applicants believe that claim 89 is clearly supported by the specification, claim 89 has been cancelled to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 89 is rendered moot.

Claims 42-60 and 84-89 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Applicants submit that the claim amendments submitted herewith overcome this rejection.

More specifically, Applicants note that the recitation of “wherein the session or message set or session set up request is released” has been deleted from claim 42. Thus, this aspect of the rejection is moot.

In addition, claims 56-59 have been amended to correct the antecedent basis issues cited by the Office Action. Claims 56 and 57 have been amended to recite “the database” instead of “the first database,” and the dependencies of claims 58 and 59 have been amended to provide antecedent basis for the elements recited therein. Therefore, this aspect of the rejection is also moot.

The Office Action further alleged that claim 42 is indefinite because the claim limitation of “checking requirements of a message, set of messages, or session from the message or message set or session set up request.” Applicants have amended this limitation of claim 42 to recite “checking requirements of a message, set of messages, or session included in the message, message set, or session set up request.” Applicants submit that this amendment clarifies that the checking requirements includes, for example, checking the requirements of a session included in the session set up request.

The Office Action also alleged that claim 84 is unclear because there does not appear to be a correlation between the “deciding” step, and the steps of “deriving” and “routing.” Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion and, therefore, respectfully traverse this aspect of the rejection. More specifically, Applicants assert that the “deciding” step is a prerequisite to the “deriving” and “routing.” In other words, according to this embodiment, a decision is made regarding the routing of the message, i.e. whether the message can be routed, and then the “deriving” and “routing” steps can take place. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 84 is clear.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that all of the objections and rejections raised by the Office Action have been addressed and overcome. As such, Applicants respectfully request that all of the presently pending claims be allowed, and a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Majid S. AlBassam  
Registration No. 54,749

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time